



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,608	01/22/2001	Yoshinori Hayashi	202114US2	9741

7590 08/23/2002

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
FOURTH FLOOR  
1755 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY  
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

PHAM, HAI CHI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2861	

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/765,608	HAYASHI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Hai C Pham	2861	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on 13 June 2002 is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 8, 9.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on 06/13/02 have been approved. A proper drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The correction to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh et al. (U.S. 5,412,408).

Itoh et al. discloses an image recording apparatus comprising:

- a photosensitive body (54) having a photosensitive layer,
- an optical scanning device having a deflector (52) deflecting a light flux emitted from a light source (51), and scanning the surface of the photosensitive body by the thus-deflected light flux,
- the apparatus being configured such that a dot is formed at a center between adjacent light fluxes as a result of the adjacent light fluxes being overlapped with

one another in a sub-scanning direction (Itoh et al. indicates in Fig. 8 that the dot formed at the center between two adjacent scanning lines being formed at the overlapping between a "dot ON" and a "dot OFF" on a preceding scan line at the position above the "dot ON" with the laser beam intensity for "dot ON" being set at a certain recording threshold level, e.g., recording level A, and further teaches the case where all the surrounding dots being ON, such as dots p2-p9 being all ON such that the center dot is formed as a result of overlapping the central dot of p1 with a dot at the position on a preceding scan line above the dot p1 and the laser beam intensity being set at a level C) (col. 6, lines 31-54),

- a ratio of a static beam-spot diameter (d) in the sub-scan direction on the surface of the photosensitive body defined by  $1/e^2$  of the maximum value in the exposure distribution of the beam spot to an interval (p) between adjacent scan lines satisfying the following formula:

$$2.0 \leq d / p < 5.0 \quad (\text{col. 5, lines 16-25}).$$

Although Itoh et al. does not disclose the exact claimed inequality, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the optimum range of values that fit the particular application, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Itoh et al. further teaches the shape of the light beam being an ellipse, and the longer diameter of the ellipse being used as the beam diameter  $d$ . Therefore, the following formula:

$$d_m / d_s < 1$$

where  $d_m$  is the static beam-spot in the main scan direction, and

$d_s$  ( $=d$ ) the static beam-spot in the sub-scan direction (col. 5, lines 26-30).

Method claims 5 and 6 are deemed to be clearly anticipated by functions of the above structures.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 have been considered, and are traversed in view of the new grounds of rejection as stated above.

### ***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai C Pham whose telephone number is (703) 308-1281. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F (8:30-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John S. Hilten can be reached on (703) 308-0719. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722, (703) 308-7724, (703) 308-7382, (703) 305-3431, (703) 305-3432 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

*hapham*

HAI PHAM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
August 19, 2002